

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 7, 9, 13 and 15 are currently being amended.

Claims 18-21 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 7, 9, 13, 15 and 18-21 are now pending in this application.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 7, 9, 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/013153 to Shinoda. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claims 7 and 13 have each been amended to recite that the IC chip stores image data which is inherently printed on the surface of the recording medium. Shinoda does not disclose or suggest that data to be printed on a surface of an image forming medium (or data to be written on an IC chip embedded in the image forming medium) can be selected from either: a) image data which is read by a scanner from the surface of a recording medium, or b) image data which is inherently printed on the surface of a recording medium, i.e., which is stored in an IC chip embedded in the recording medium, in accordance with an operational mode instructed by a user.

In the system of Shinoda, in order to achieve the desired object, i.e., insuring the reliability of the document issued by the issuer, image data registered in a database (or image data stored in an IC chip) is output to a printer or the like only when it has been confirmed that the document is a recording medium (original).

In contrast, in the invention according to independent claims 7 and 13, an image to be printed on the surface of the image forming medium (or data to be written on the IC chip which is embedded in the image forming medium) can be selected from: a) an image read by a scanner from the surface of a recording medium, and b) image data stored in an IC chip which is embedded in the recording medium, in accordance with the user's instruction.

By this feature, any user can easily choose the image to be printed on a surface of the image forming medium from the image read by a scanner from the surface of a recording medium, and image data which is inherently printed on the surface of a recording medium, i.e., which is stored in an IC chip embedded in the recording medium. Further, the advantage brought about by the presently claimed invention is that, even if a memo or the like is written on the surface of the recording medium, a user can easily select whether to print image data inherently printed on the surface of the recording medium before a memo was written, or print an image of the surface of the present recording medium including the memo that was written on the surface of the recording medium.

In regard to the above-stated difference, page 13 of the Office Action asserts that "The selecting of data to be printed on the surface of the image forming medium is based on a printing request initiated by a qualified user (determined through authentication of the document ID)". However, please note that Shinoda fails to disclose or suggest features in which a user can select the data to be printed from image data of the surface of the recording medium which is read by a scanner, and image data which is inherently printed on the surface of the recording medium and stored in the IC chip. If this rejection is maintained, the PTO is respectfully requested to specifically point out where these features are disclosed or suggested by Shinoda, or otherwise withdraw this rejection.

Also, please note that the remarks provided in the previously-filed reply are also applicable to the presently pending claims.

Accordingly, presently pending claims 7 and 13 (as well as dependent claims 9 and 15) are not anticipated by Shinoda.

**New Claims:**

New claims 18-21 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide an additional basis of patentability for these claims, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claims.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 26, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Registration No. 40,888  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819